## *Amendments to the Drawings*

Please replace drawings sheets 1 through 5 including FIGs. 1-5 with the attached amended drawings sheets 1 through 5. The amended drawings sheets include formal drawings for FIGs. 1-5.

## *Remarks*

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1-19, 21, 22, 24-27, 29, 30, 34-41, 43-46 are pending in the application, with claims 1, 9, 18, 35, and 38 being the independent claims. Claims 20, 23, 28, 31-33, and 42 are sought to be cancelled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter therein. New claims 45 and 46 are sought to be added. Claims 18, 19, 21, 22, 24-27, 29, 34, 38, 39, 43, and 44 are sought to be amended. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

### *Claim Objections*

Claim 25 was objected to because of a typographical error. Applicant has amended claim 25 as suggested by the Examiner. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection are therefore respectfully requested.

### *Objections to the Drawings*

In the Office Action, the drawings were objected to because "[t]he submitted drawings are hand-drawn." (Office Action, p. 2). Applicant has filed formal drawings herewith. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection are therefore requested.

***Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102***

Claims 18-20, 25-28, 38, 39, and 42 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being clearly anticipated by Simon et al, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0093691 ("Simon"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Simon does not teach or suggest each and every element of Applicant's amended independent claims 18 and 38. In Simon, a cryptographic node stores negotiated security associations in a security association repository. (Simon, ¶ [0059]). The cryptographic node is responsible for performing the security association distribution procedure to direct the stored security associations to the plurality of edge routers. (Simon, ¶ [0035]). The edge routers use the security associations for communicating securely with end nodes. (Simon, ¶ [0060]). Thus, the centralized cryptographic node handles distribution of the security association information to the routers communicating directly with the end nodes. The edge routers do not distribute security association information to each other in Simon.

Simon describes an update procedure in which an edge router broadcasts updates to security association information to "multiple nodes connected to the back-end network" when the end node terminates a link-layer association. (Simon, ¶ [0080]). Thus, Simon does not teach or suggest the direct updating of security association information between edge routers during an active link layer connection.

Thus, Simon does not teach or suggest:

> A method of providing redundancy in a security processing system comprising the steps of:
>
> establishing a first secure packet flow through a first security processor; updating security association information associated with the first secure packet flow;
>
> establishing a second secure packet flow through a second security processor;
>
> updating security association information associated with the second secure packet flow;
>
> sending the updated security association information associated with the first secure packet flow from the first security processor to the second security processor at a first predefined interval;
>
> sending the updated security association information associated with the second secure packet flow for the second security processor to the first security processor at a second predefined interval; and
>
> storing the updated security association information associated with the first secure packet flow and the updated security association information associated with the second secure packet flow in the first security processor and in the second security processor.

as recited in amended independent claim 18. Simon also does not teach or suggest:

> A security processing system, comprising:
>
> a first security processor configured to process a first packet flow and update security association information in response to the first packet flow; and
>
> a second security processor configured to process a second packet flow and update security association information in response to the second packet flow
>
> wherein the first security processor is further configured to send the updated security association information in response to the first packet flow to the second security processor at a first predefined interval and the second security processor is further configured to send the updated security association information in response to the second packet flow to the first security processor.

as recited in amended independent claim 38. For at least these reasons, independent claims 18 and 38 are patentable over Simon. Claims 19 and 25-27 depend from claim 18 and claim 39 depends from claim 38. For at least the above reasons, and further in

view of their own features, dependent claims 19, 25-27, and 29 are patentable over Simon. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

***Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103***

Simon and Xiong

Claims 21-24 and 29-34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Simon and in view of Xiong, et al, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0061507 (Xiong). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claims 21, 22, 24, 29, 30, and 34 depend from amended claim 18. Xiong does not overcome the deficiencies of Simon relative to amended claim 18 described above. For at least these reasons, and further in view of their own features, dependent claims 21, 22, 24, 29, 30, and 34 are patentable over the combination of Simon and Xiong. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are therefore respectfully requested.

Simon and Rosenow

Claims 40, 41, 43, and 44 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Simon and in view of Rosenow, et al, U.S. Patent No. 5,022,076 (Rosenow). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claims 40, 41, 43, and 44 depend from amended claim 38. Rosenow does not overcome the deficiencies of Simon relative to amended claim 38 described above. For at least these reasons, and further in view of their own features, dependent claims

40, 41, 43, and 44 are patentable over the combination of Simon and Rosenow. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are therefore respectfully requested.

## *Conclusion*

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicant believes that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.

Lori A. Gordon
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 50,633

Date: February 13, 2008

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600
781770_1.DOC